

From: FX-6 Personal Privacy
To: sunger@waterboards.ca.gov; Cowens@waterboards.ca.gov; mfellows@nasa.gov; thomas.johnson@em.doe.gov; william.backous@emcbc.doe.gov; stephanie.jennings@emcbc.doe.gov; lance.martin@emcbc.doe.gov; richard.schassburger@emcbc.doe.gov; Thomas.D.Gallacher@boeing.com; Kamara.Sams@boeing.com; Craig.Cooper/R9/USEPA/US@EPA; Nicole.Moutoux/R9/USEPA/US@EPA; Gregg.Dempsey/LV/USEPA/US@EPA; Assemblymember.Blumenfield@assembly.ca.gov
Cc: John.Popoch@asm.ca.gov; Samantha.Stevens@asm.ca.gov; Molly.O'Brien@feinstein.senate.gov
Subject: Letter to Secretary Adams re the CAG, the Boeing Lawsuit, and the Workgroup
Date: 07/05/2010 03:28 PM

To all:

My gmail was not allowing me to add additional names last night. So I am sending this on to you today so that you know what I told the State.

Chris

From: crwhnc@gmail.com
To: LAdams@calepa.ca.gov, LBrown@calepa.ca.gov, billie.greer@gov.ca.gov, skoyasako@calepa.ca.gov, NLong@dtsc.ca.gov, Montgomery.Michael@epamail.epa.gov, diamond.jane@epamail.epa.gov, MMovassa@dtsc.ca.gov, RBrausch@dtsc.ca.gov, MMalinow@dtsc.ca.gov, gabrams@dtsc.ca.gov, SCallery@dtsc.ca.gov
CC: cwalsh@cleanuprocketdyne.org, bjmillier@mail.house.gov, Lisa.Pinto@mail.house.gov, mitch.englander@lacity.org, FX-6 Personal Privacy, Jarrod.DeGonia@asm.ca.gov, FX-6 Personal Privacy
 Sent: 7/5/2010 3:49:15 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
 Subj: Re: Cal/EPA PRA 2010-21

Dear Secretary Adams,

I know that this email string began regarding a Public Records request by Christina Walsh. I also know that several people have written to you to request a CAG.

First, I want to say that I was very grateful to have the opportunity to talk to you two years ago. I do believe that you care. However, when I spoke to you last, you said that you were not aware that your visit to Santa Susana was a secret. I have since seen emails - I am not sure if you met with some community members besides Dan. I do think it would have been nice if we could have been invited to be there with you as well. Or it would have been nice to be able to meet you at DTSC or at the Governor's office. By just seeing a few community members, this "pits" one group against another. I know that this was not your understanding of your site visit or your intention.

Second, I want to thank Billie Greer for the time that she has put into this issue. I think that she is very fair. In the times that I have gotten to speak to her - I know she has a lot of wisdom or she would not be where she is today.

I genuinely believe that everyone is on the same page - we all want the Santa Susana Field Lab cleaned up to a safe level to protect human health and to protect the environment.

What I do believe is that the site was very contaminated many years ago. And what I also believe is that over the last approximately 30 years, there has been a great deal of remediation done under the various inter agency agreements - DTSC, CAL EPA, the LARWQCB, and the DOE /AEC. The federal EPA has been on this project for more than 20 years with the eyes of Gregg Dempsey. And the CDPH has been reviewing the site for years.

I believe that "fear" has been created in my community regarding the risk of cancer from this site. And I also believe that most people do not understand cancer and risk.

This is probably the most important issue today - to control the fears of the community that everyone offsite is at risk of cancer from this site today. I hear too many people in West Hills and the surrounding communities say - "my mother had cancer". And I ask - what kind? And I hear - lung. And I ask - was she a smoker? Yes. But everyone thinks their cancer is from the SSFL because of the media coverage.

If there were people living up there that were exposed to vapor intrusion or using the soil for gardening and for crop production - that would be a problem. But to my knowledge, we are not drawing any water for drinking from the site. We are not eating anything grown on the site.

We need to keep our eyes on the real goal - not letting this property ever become used for residences or to grow food. And we do not want to blend the water from the site with any clean water. This is an issue that is being addressed in the San Fernando Valley right now - the blending of water from the east San Fernando Valley which is near a Superfund site with water that is imported. To my understanding, and I say this with the confidence of my personal conversations with the LADWP - no water in the west San Fernando Valley is used for drinking water.

My greatest concern is that we are so busy fighting over the CAG issue that we are forgetting that there is a lawsuit. Instead of fighting over the CAG - and believe me - I do understand why many people want a CAG - we need to really be discussing what we want from this site.

I am trying to read the Boeing lawsuit sequentially. I got it in bits and pieces in the beginning. Now DTSC has 19 different files organized on their website.

What I would like to say to the representatives of the elected officials is this;

1) The Workgroup does not represent the majority of the people that are actively involved in the SSFL community. It may have at one time. But the rifts are too deep. It really only represents those who live in Simi Valley with a few exceptions.

2) On the EPA website, I was reading a document regarding the Workgroup costs. With Marie Rainwater and the facility rental - the cost is over \$65,000. With the mailings to the community for four meetings - about \$34,000, the cost of those four meetings a year is almost \$100,000. And that money is money from the Federal Stimulus money - I believe - that was earmarked for the DOE cleanup of AREA IV. This is our tax payer dollars at work.

I ask that the Workgroup meetings not be continued next year with those costs in mind. I would rather see meetings that are held at DTSC, at the Regional Board, on site, that are educational. I would like that money to be spent to inform the community regarding their health risks. I would like to see the EPA TASC team come in and read the technical documents for us so that we can understand what those numbers mean in terms of health risk. The average person has to be taught what levels of significance are by someone with a health background.

For example, most people do not understand that the TMDLS for the LA River and the NPDES permits are geared to the most sensitive aquatic life. Those levels would - in many cases - be higher for MCL's. This is why Boeing is paying fines - because of the levels necessary to protect the aquatic life downstream. And ultimately, I have heard the LADWP Board of Commissioners say - they would like to capture that water and treat it rather than see it go out to sea.

There are already many health risk studies - the former worker studies by UCLA, by Boeing with the UAW, by the CDPH, by ATSDR. And there is Dr. Mack's book on "Cancer Incidence in the Urban Environment". And most recently, we have Dr. Morgenstern et al's Community Health Study. Someone with a health background should be able to summarize all of those documents

and we should have a discussion on health risk. You could even bring in all of these people who have written these studies - Dr Ritz and Dr. Cohen of UCLA, Dr. Morgenstern of U of Michigan, Dr. Boice for the Boeing Health Study, Dr. Mack, and the CDPH. Bring in some of the people from ATSDR. Have them all read all of the documents.

Have them do an Expert Panel. I bet it would not cost more to do what is called "a literature review" - and with current data from the CDPH - than it costs to put on 4 Workgroup meetings. I believe that these health studies to date have cost the tax payers millions of dollars. So please - let's get experts to review them and put the community's mind at rest regarding health risk.

For me, the greatest problem is that Dan Hirsch is "recognized" as speaking on behalf of the community. I am sure that Dan has his supporters. But I can say without a doubt - Dan also has many people who do not accept him as the spoke person for the SSFL community - as you can see in this email string.

We all know that Dan authored SB 990 with Senator Kuehl. We heard Julia Brownley tell us how he helped walk it through the Assembly. I have been told that Christina Walsh, Bill Bowling, John Luker, and Dave Carey also went to Sacramento to walk that bill around.

We, the residents of the SSFL community should be heard more than "environmental groups" who do not even live in our area. Many of these groups do not attend the DTSC technical meetings, they are not at the EPA technical meetings, they are not at the Regional Board meetings. While Dan is at those meetings, groups like the "Sierra Club", the NRDC, PSR-LA, and the Union of Concerned Scientists are not at these meetings. I used to belong to two of these groups - I don't anymore because I realize that they are writing letters that are uninformed.

So I ask - why are they allowed to sign a Letter of Intent on behalf of my community?

This is also true of the petition with more than 250 signatures that supported the DTSC meetings and the Workgroup. Since only maybe 30? community members attend the DTSC technical meetings - how does anyone who has not been there know to sign to support them?

When I was in my 20's, I worked in hospitals. It was my responsibility to get an "Informed Consent" signed for treatment or prior to a medical procedure. I do not believe that the people that signed the "other petition" signed with "Informed Consent". I think people signed because their friends asked them to. I do know for a fact that one of my WHNC Board members signed - just because a friend asked her to. And also, this same person, has been to two Workgroup meetings in about a year. And she has said: "I am good for another year." Another WHNC Board member walked out half the way through when he attended.

There are 25 WHNC Board members. I only know one that supports the Workgroup in its present format. And that is because that person was just appointed to be on the Workgroup. A couple other WHNC Board members believe that they can influence the Workgroup to be changed. I am no longer that naive.

This is one of the other points - these are literally appointments by Dan with the support of the other three community members. They are not voted upon by the agency leaders or RPs to the best of my understanding.

I do not know how a group can use tax payer money and continue in perpetuity without any elections, no need to educate the community beyond those four meetings, and no responsibility for anyone to get the new people up to speed.

Since the first part of the Boeing lawsuit ends in a "prayer to the court", this is my prayer: The State of California will negotiate a "Consent Agreement" with all parties that allows tolling for the Boeing Company, a reservation of rights the same as the State, NASA, and the DOE had. I pray that you can agree that with the Balancing Criteria - that you will be able to determine the necessary standards after we have "Background" and after we have characterized the site to a

residential standard.

It was with the wisdom of DTSC and CAL EPA to create the original 2007 Consent Order. It would be my assumption that DTSC did that in good faith with their responsibility to protect the public health.

I pray that this will be settled before a protracted lawsuit occurs that could end with the State losing. And then, we could end up with orders by the judge not only that SB 990 is Unconstitutional, but also, the judge could order that the federal EPA take this site as the lead agency.

We must work together with respect - and be careful what we wish for. It is my community that will have to bare the burden of the delay of a lawsuit and the burden of the increased truckloads in both directions if we are obligated to clean up to a 100% agricultural standard.

Sincerely,

Chris Rowe